

SUMMARY

Public Input Phase III

City of Sugar Land

Land Use Plan Updating Process

On May 12 and 19, 2004, citizens interested in future land uses for decision areas 4 and 5 and decision area 6 directed comments to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Many of the speakers were eager to be participants in the process, and offered land use concepts that would be either be opposed or embraced by the existing residential community. The minutes of the two meetings and relevant emailed comments are attached. There are some common themes that can be summarized as follows.

AREAS 4 AND 5

Mixed Use concepts

A recurring theme focused on the natural beauty and environmentally sensitive nature of the majority of the area. Citizens favored future development coupled with conservation strategies that would result in preservation, enhancement, and encouragement of passive recreational use of Gannoway Lake, Oyster Creek, and other natural greenways. Preservation of the Imperial Sugar buildings to redevelop as a mix of private and public uses was discussed and repeatedly supported in conjunction with the open space concepts.

Residential Uses

Many of the speakers expressed a strong opinion that any residential uses ought to be single family of a density and quality that is typically found in other single family residential areas of the City of Sugar Land. Any other housing style would likely be opposed, except perhaps in very small quantities to deal with otherwise conflicting land use adjacencies. Some indicated that the condominium and live-work townhomes as proposed in the “mixed-use residential” category would not be acceptable. The category itself seemed to be confused with the “mixed use residential retail”. Any uses that would result in lower quality or higher density residential uses (such as standard apartment style development) would be opposed.

Retail Commercial Uses

Any retail use along Burney Road would be opposed. Retail in the form of light commercial (especially those that would be pedestrian oriented) may be tolerated near US 90A or State Highway 6 if included as part of a well-planned approach to creek preservation and enhancement.

Office and Light Industrial Uses

The area of greatest concern and interest seemed to be that nearest the Burney Road area. However, several people commented that those uses that further the City’s economic development interests should not be concentrated on the north side of the City (north of

90 A). Other input indicated that economic development uses may be acceptable if the uses are limited to those specific uses that the City considers among its “target industries”, if the buildings are well designed and of superior quality, and if the overall development is compatible with other existing and future uses in the vicinity.

AREA 6

The three scenarios prepared by staff differ only in that three types of residential uses are shown. The area residents who spoke preferred a standard single family classification and indicated opposition to any other pattern that would result in higher densities. The property owner offered assurances that development is not imminent, but that when it does occur, that he would request flexibility in the lot yield to deal with the physical constraints of the land.

DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS – BOTH AREAS

In addition to land use concepts, some of the speakers expressed development related such as drainage, flooding, future roadways, and other infrastructure needs, both existing and future.

STAFF RESPONSE

Most of the concepts discussed in the meetings could be accommodated by one or a combination of the scenarios. Therefore, with the exception of updating the maps to clarify categories and to add landmarks, the draft maps remain largely unchanged since the last Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. In response to specific comments, we recommend the following:

- ❑ Specify in the text as follows: Impacts of future development should be addressed through code compliance and impact mitigation practices. All existing and proposed infrastructure should be brought up to standards with future development.
- ❑ Clarify in the text that the intent of the “mixed use residential” classification is for such areas to be exclusively residential and that ultimate zoning is to be through the Planned Development District rezoning process. Specific residential types, densities, buffering, and other development issues can be addressed at the time the property is rezoned when development becomes imminent.
- ❑ Recommend in the text that implementation of any future “light industrial” area is to occur subsequent to creation of a new zoning district that lists the City’s target industries and incorporates buffering and design standards.
- ❑ Recommend in the text that overall (gross) densities in any residential areas in Areas 4, 5, and 6 should remain similar to other single family subdivisions in the City.

- ❑ Continue with studies to locate a community park in Area 6.
- ❑ Continue to pursue options to retain the western half of Gannoway Lakes and explore options for surrounding areas through the Parks Master Plan update. Add a reference to the Parks Master Plan to the text.
- ❑ As a part of the Parks Master Plan update, study the potential for implementing a trail system along Oyster Creek. Add a statement to the Areas 4 and 5 section to include a vision for a pedestrian trail.
- ❑ Recommend in the text that any public/private partnerships that will preserve the Imperial buildings and rehabilitate them through adaptive reuse will be supported.